

## REMARKS

Claims 1-25 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-25 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 11, 16, 19, 22, and 24 have been amended. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1-25 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

### 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-14 and 16-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0149571 (hereafter Roberts), in view of Murakami et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,130,500 (hereafter Murakami). These rejections are respectfully traversed. It appears that paragraph #3 on page 2 of the Office Action refers to Claim 14 instead of Claim 15.

Independent Claim 1 recites (as amended):

A display assembly for a handheld electronic device comprising:  
a display mechanism;  
a plurality of pressure activated sensors; and  
***a housing for enclosing said display mechanism and said pressure activated sensors, said housing comprising:  
an external surface that defines perimeter of said handheld electronic device;***  
a single-piece bezel-less top cover that allows mechanical transfer between said top cover and said plurality of pressure activated sensors, wherein said pressure activated sensors can be

activated by mechanical pressure applied to the external surface of said single-piece bezel-less top cover, and  
a back cover coupled to said single-piece bezel-less top cover ***such that an area, which represents transition between said back cover and said single-piece bezel-less top cover, of said external surface is flush.*** (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that the combination of Roberts and Murakami does not teach, motivate, or suggest the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 1 recites the limitations, ***"a housing for enclosing said display mechanism and said pressure activated sensors,"*** (emphasis added), and, "said housing comprising: ***an external surface that defines perimeter of said handheld electronic device...a back cover coupled to said single-piece bezel-less top cover such that an area, which represents transition between said back cover and said single-piece bezel-less top cover, of said external surface is flush,***" (emphasis added). At page 2 of the Office Action, it is admitted that Roberts does not teach the top cover is a single-piece bezel-less, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Further, items 15 and 16 of Figures 2A and 2B, respectively, Col. 3, lines 32-33, and Col. 4, line 39, of Murakami are cited as teaching a cover plastic film (15, 16) is a single-piece bezel-less. Also, item 104 of Roberts and paragraphs 0084-0086 of Roberts are cited as teaching a back cover (104).

However, Roberts shows items 104, 104a, and 104b as being a frame inside an enclosure (202) including bezel (203) and alignment feature (204)

instead of being a back cover. [Roberts; Figures 2, 3, 6, and 7A-7C; [0084]].

Further, Figure 7C of Roberts provides a detailed view of an alternate embodiment of Figure 2 of Roberts, where the bezel (203a) and alignment feature (204) of the enclosure (202) are illustrated in greater detail and where the frame (104) continues to be inside the enclosure (202). Moreover, the enclosure (202) includes an external surface that defines the perimeter of a device (201, 301), as shown in Figures 2 and 3. However, enclosure (202) is a housing that does not enclose the display mechanism and the pressure activated sensors instead of being a housing that encloses the display mechanism and the pressure activated sensors, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. That is, Roberts fails to teach, motivate, or suggest a housing that encloses the display mechanism and the pressure activated sensors, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Even if item 108C of Figure 7C is assumed to be a top cover and the enclosure (202) is assumed to be a back cover, the transition between item 108C and bezel (203) of the enclosure (202) is not flush instead of being flush, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Thus, Roberts also fails to teach, motivate, or suggest a housing that comprises an external surface, a single-piece bezel-less top cover, and a back cover such that an area, which represents transition between the back cover and the single-piece bezel-less top cover, of the external surface is flush, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1.

Furthermore, Murakami shows a tablet (1) laminated with vinyl plastic film (15) in Figure 2A instead of showing a housing comprising a single-piece bezel-

less top cover and a back cover, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1.

Also, Murakami shows, in Figure 2B, a tablet (1) having a housing enclosing a sensor (11) and a shielding plate (14) and consisting of an external surface, a top frame (16), and a bottom frame (17) such that transition between the top frame (16) and the bottom frame (17) on the external surface is not flush instead of showing a housing for enclosing the display mechanism and the pressure activated sensors and comprising an external surface, a single-piece bezel-less top cover, and a back cover such that an area, which represents transition between the back cover and the single-piece bezel-less top cover, of the external surface is flush, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. That is, Murakami fails to teach, motivate, or suggest a housing that encloses the display mechanism and the pressure activated sensors and that comprises an external surface, a single-piece bezel-less top cover, and a back cover such that an area, which represents transition between the back cover and the single-piece bezel-less top cover, of the external surface is flush, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1.

Thus, the combination of Roberts and Murakami does not teach, motivate, or suggest all the limitations of Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Roberts and Murakami and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-14 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over the combination of Roberts and Murakami. Hence, it

is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-14 are patentable over the combination of Roberts and Murakami for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 16 and 22, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 16 and 22 recites similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 16 recites the limitations, "**a housing for enclosing said display mechanism and said pressure activated sensors,**" (emphasis added), and, the housing comprising "**an external surface... a back cover coupled to said transparent single-piece cover such that an area, which represents transition between said back cover and said transparent single-piece cover, of said external surface is flush,**" (emphasis added). Independent Claim 22 recites the limitations, "**said housing encloses said display mechanism and said pressure activated sensors,**" (emphasis added), and, the housing comprising "**an external surface...said back cover is coupled to said transparent single-piece cover such that an area, which represents transition between said back cover and said transparent single-piece cover, of said external surface is flush,**" (emphasis added). As discussed above, the combination of Roberts and Murakami fails to teach, suggest, or motivate the cited limitations. Therefore, Independent Claims 16 and 22 are allowable over the combination of Roberts and Murakami for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 17-21 and Dependent Claims 23-25 dependent on allowable Independent Claims 16 and 22, respectively, which are allowable over the combination of Roberts and Murakami. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 17-21 and Dependent Claims 23-25 are patentable over the combination of Roberts and Murakami for the reasons discussed above.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0149571 (hereafter Roberts), in view of Murakami et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,130,500 (hereafter Murakami), in view of Donohue et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,262,717 (hereafter Donohue), and in view of Singh et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,400,376 (hereafter Singh). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claim 15 is dependent on allowable Independent Claims 1, which is allowable over the combination of Roberts and Murakami. Moreover, Donahue and Singh do not teach, suggest, or motivate a housing that encloses the display mechanism and the pressure activated sensors and that comprises an external surface, a single-piece bezel-less top cover, and a back cover such that an area, which represents transition between the back cover and the single-piece bezel-less top cover, of the external surface is flush, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Roberts, Murakami, Donahue, and Singh for the reasons discussed above. Since Dependent Claim 15 depends from

Independent Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claim 15 is patentable over the combination of Roberts, Murakami, Donahue, and Singh for the reasons discussed above.

### CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, remarks, and arguments overcome all rejections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-25) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-25) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 01/05/06

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia  
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060